



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1455
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,490

11/21/2003

Barry D. Atkins

RSW920030244US1

2514

43168 7590 01/26/2007
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/719,490	Applicant(s) ATKINS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanhnga B. Truong	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU 2135

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/03; 5/23/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on November 21, 2003. Claims 1-20 are pending. At this time, claims 1-20 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 21, 2003 and May 23, 2005 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 19 recites "a computer program product for providing federated identity management within a distributed content aggregation framework, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising: computer-readable program code means for providing, to the content aggregation framework by a using entity, initial identity information; computer-readable program code means for authenticating the initial identity information by a first authentication service in a first security domain; computer-readable program code means for conveying results of the authentication by the first authentication service to one or more selected other authentication services associated with one or more other security domains; and computer-readable program code means for using the conveyed results to authenticate the using entity to each of the selected other authentication services, without requiring the using entity to provide additional identity information." The claim is clearly a software program and it is non-statutory as not being tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Therefore, claim 19 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 20 has limitation that is similar to those of claim 19, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 19 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Joshi et al (US 7,134,137 B2).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Joshi teaches a method of providing cross-domain authentication in a computing environment (column 5, lines 30-55 of Joshi), comprising steps of:

(1) providing security credentials of an entity to an initial point of contact in the computing environment (**column 2, lines 48-50 and 53-54; column 7, lines 18-21 of Joshi**);

(2) passing the provided credentials from the initial point of contact to a trust proxy (**column 7, lines 15-27 of Joshi**);

(3) authenticating the passed credentials with an authentication service in a local security domain of the trust proxy (column 7, lines 15-21; column 8, lines 46-58 of Joshi); and

(4) using the authentication performed by the local authentication service to seamlessly authenticate the entity to one or more selected remote security domains (**see Figure 28 and more details in column 29, lines 63-67 through column 30, lines 1-7; column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) when the using step further comprises the steps of: consulting policy information to determine which of a plurality of remote security domains should be selected to receive information from the local authentication service; and passing the information from the local authentication service to each of the determined remote security domains (**column 48, lines 26-59 of Joshi**).

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the using step enables remote services in the selected remote security domains to be accessed by the entity without requiring the entity to provide its security credentials for those remote services (**column 18, lines 60-64 of Joshi**).

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein a credential mapping operation is performed to map the provided security credentials to the entity's security credentials for each remote service (**column 12, lines 58-67 through column 13, lines 1-5; column 33, lines 4-19 of Joshi**).

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity is an end user (**column 33, lines 4-6 of Joshi**).

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial point of contact is a portal interface (**column 34, lines 17-28 of Joshi**).

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the passing step is performed by a proxy of the initial point of contact (**column 7, lines 15-27 of Joshi**).

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the proxy of the initial point of contact performs a protocol conversion, when passing the provided credentials, from a first protocol used in the providing step to a second protocol used by the trust proxy (**column 3, lines 3-21 of Joshi**).

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the first protocol is Hypertext Transfer Protocol ("HTTP") or a security-enhanced version thereof (**column 3, lines 3-4; column 6, lines 25-33 of Joshi**).

j. Referring to claim 11:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial point of contact provides an aggregation of a plurality of Web services (**column 6, lines 60-67 of Joshi**).

k. Referring to claim 12:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the using step further comprises the steps of: forwarding a security token from the local authentication service to a remote trust proxy in each of the selected remote security domains; and using the forwarded security token, at each of the remote trust proxies, to authenticate the entity with an authentication service in the remote security domain (**column 48, lines 18-43 of Joshi**).

l. Referring to claim 13:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein results of the authentication by the authentication service in the local security domain and results of each authentication by

the authentication services in each selected remote security domain are returned to the initial point of contact (**column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**).

m. Referring to claim 14:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of determining, by the initial point of contact, which services and/or views thereof can be provided to the entity based on the returned results (**column 48, lines 44-59 of Joshi**).

n. Referring to claim 15:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity has security credentials, in at least one of the selected remote security domains, that differ from the provided security credentials, and wherein the using step transparently maps the provided security credentials to the different security credentials (**column 12, lines 58-67 through column 13, lines 1-5; column 33, lines 4-19 of Joshi**).

o. Referring to claim 16-17:

i. These system claims are drawn to the system corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-15. Therefore system claims 16-17 correspond to method claims 1-16, and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation (obviousness) as used above.

p. Referring to claim 18:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the entity is a programmatic entity (**column 41, lines 7-17 of Joshi**).

q. Referring to claims 19-20:

i. These system claims are drawn to a computer program product corresponding to the method of using same as claimed in claims 1-15. Therefore a computer program product claims 16-17 correspond to method claims 1-15, and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation (obviousness) as used above.

r. Referring to claim 20:

i. Joshi further teaches:

(1) wherein the initial identity information is a name and password associated with the using entity (**column 20, lines 36-38 of Joshi**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joshi et al (US 7,134,137 B2), and further in view of Bradee (US 7,131,000).

a. Referring to claim 10:

i. Joshi further teaches an access system using different kind of communications protocols, such as, HTTP and remote procedure calls (RPC), however, Joshi is silent on the SOAP, which is another protocol just like RPC. On the other hand, Bradee teaches:

(1) wherein the second protocol is Simple Object Access Protocol ("SOAP") (**column 5, lines 25-31 of Bradee**).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified Joshi's system with the teaching of Bradee for providing data to applications from an access system (**column 1, lines 41-42 of Joshi**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified Joshi's system with the teaching of Bradee that delivers the ability to effectively secure and manage all the various network-based interactions (**column 2, lines 24-26 of Joshi**).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Fu et al (US 2004/0111519 A1) discloses a network system includes a network edge point configured to provide a terminal with access to a network. The network edge point includes a security policy associated with the terminal, and controls communications between the network and the terminal according to the security policy. Figure 1 shows further details of cross-domain authentication that could read into claim 1 of current application (see abstract).

b. Sitaraman et al (US 6,212,561 B1) discloses a method and apparatus for providing the owners of domain sites on a computer network or the owners of private remotely accessible intra networks the capability to force authorized users to disconnect from any open connections to other public or private domains or networks before a connection with the owners domain or network can be established. Figure 5 shows further details of cross-domain authentication that could read into claim 1 of current application (see abstract).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

TBT/TBT
January 22, 2007

Thanhnga B. Truong
Primary Examiner
AU2135